Progressive Calvinism

Copyright, 1955, by Progressive Calvinism League

VOLUME I MAY, 1955 NUMBER 5

Understanding and Misunderstanding The Hebrew-Christian Law of Love

D. ARROGANCE AND SANCTIMONIOUSNESS ASSOCIATED WITH OTHER DEFINITIONS OF BROTHERLY LOVE

This is the fourth section of an analysis of the Hebrew-Christian Law of Love. Christianity and communism cannot be reconciled; they are opposing systems. But many Christian thinkers have come to identify the Christian law of love with the communist law of love. The purpose of this analysis is to discover by what fallacies that is apparently accomplished.

The previous sections had the following titles:

A. The Plain Teaching of Scripture Regarding Brotherly Love (February issue)

B. Analytical Dissection of Scriptural Law of Brotherly Love (March issue)

C. Scriptural Corrections of Popular Errors Concerning Law Requiring Brotherly Love (April issue)

It will not be possible to understand the full meaning of what follows without having read the three sections just mentioned.

The first three sections were largely positive. They briefly outlined the scriptural doctrine of brotherly love. The general *pattern* of that doctrine has been outlined, but as Scripture abounds in statements concerning love it was not practical to consider *every* text referring to love.

Now we turn to those statements of the doctrine of brotherly love which have become widely accepted among men who declare

Published each month by the Progressive Calvinism League. Founders of the League: Frederick Nymeyer, John Van Mouwerik and Martin B. Nymeyer. Subscription price: $2.00 per year (for students, $1.00 per year); single copies, 50 cents. Address all subscriptions and communications to Progressive Calvinism League, 366 East 166th Street, South Holland, Illinois, U. S. A.

that they are Christians, but which statements do two things: (1) they deviate from Scripture, and (2) they agree with the basic premise underlying the communist law of love, which law is, from each according to his ability to each according to his need. This section then is more negative in character; it aims to initiate a rebuttal to the communist law of love. The *full* rebuttal, however, will require extensive and varied arguments, from the social sciences as well as from Scripture.

Outline of This Section

Consideration will be given to the following:

1. Do Religious Leaders Really Identify the Christion Law of Love With the Communist Law of Love?
2. How Do Christian Leaders Accomplish Identification of the Two Laws of Love?
3. The Principle of "Extension" as Known to Logicians
4. The "Extension" Itself; the Pseudo-Biblical Doctrine of Brotherly Love
5. Voluntary Collectivism
6. The Popular New Religion of Agape
7. The Coercion of Recipients
8. The Coercion of Givers
9. Mental Coercion
10. John Calvin on Freedom Versus Tyranny
11. A Voluntary Versus a Coercive Society
12. The Bond of Society — Legitimate Self-Regarding Interests
13. Summary

Do Religious Leaders Really Identify the Christian Law of Love With the Communist Law of Love?

Many outstanding religious leaders in the world do identify the Hebrew-Christian law of love, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, with the communist law of love, from each according

to his ability to each according to his need. There are a few conspicuous exceptions.

The foregoing statement is true of such outstanding leaders as: Reinhold Niebuhr of Union Theological Seminary; Karl Barth; Emil Brunner; G. Bromley Oxnam, Bishop of the Methodist church; E. Stanley Jones, world-famous Methodist missionary leader; and Toyohiko Kagawa, the well-known Japanese. The statement is also true of the principal spokesmen for the World Council of Churches. It is true of a faculty member of the Free University of Amsterdam as was quoted in the February issue of PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM. And it is also true of public statements which stand unchallenged in orthodox denominations.

In this issue we shall quote two outstanding liberal religious leaders, Dr. E. Stanley Jones and Toyohiko Kagawa.

We shall quote them indirectly, using a specific incident as a setting for the quotations.

From July 26 to August 2, 1953, the Second Biennial Conference of the Far Eastern Council of Christian Churches met in Karuizawa, Japan. This Council is a sectional organization affiliated with the International Council of Christian Churches (generally known as the I. C. C. C.). At this Council several resolutions were passed, of which one was the following:

Resolution on Dr. E. Stanley Jones

> In view of the visit to certain Far Eastern lands in recent months of Dr. E. Stanley Jones, a Methodist missionary and a leading figure in the World Council of Churches, the Far Eastern Council of Christian Churches is constrained to lift its voice against the position of Dr. Jones which is aiding communist world revolution.
>
> Dr. Jones, by means of Christian terminology and in the name of what he calls Christianity, has actually championed the communist economic order. We list instances of this:
>
> 1. Dr. Jones conceives of the Kingdom of God as a social order embracing the entire world. He accepts as the economic foundation of this Kingdom the economic

foundation of communism as expressed in the Russian Constitution. He writes in his book, *The Choice Before Us,* "The fruits of the Kingdom in a material life would be a fundamental justice to every man apart from class and race and birth; a holding of the means of production by all on behalf of all; a brotherhood that would make life a family instead of a feud; a sense of destiny and direction coming from the fact that God is in the corporate life giving meaning, permanence, depth, and redemption to the whole" (p. 30).

He further says, "In this new Society of the Kingdom we shall exclude none, but when some exclude themselves in spirit, then they thereby exclude themselves in sharing. If they refuse to cooperate, they are refused fruits of cooperation. They segregate themselves, so they must live to themselves — and perish by that very isolation. There will be a simple rule — from each according to his ability. If they refuse this, then they cut themselves off from the first part — to each according to his need" (p. 203).

In Dr. Jones' book, *Mahatma Gandhi: An Interpretation,* he gives expressions to the same concept of the Kingdom, and declares, "It will be a Kingdom of God society. That society is struggling to be born" (p. 201).

2. Dr. Jones accepts the communist thesis "from each according to his ability, to each according to his need."

He writes in *The Choice Before Us,* "I know that some of the objections to communism are based on partial knowledge or misunderstanding. For instance, the statement that communism loses sight of the individual in the mass is obviously not true of a theory that culminates in the words: "To each according to his need, and from each according to his ability." The fact is, as some one has said, 'Communism is the only political theory that really holds the Christian position of the absolute equality of every individual' " (pp. 133, 134).

> Dr. E. Stanley Jones has become a propagandist throughout the free world for a concept of society which is in conflict with the teaching of the Bible and of our Lord Jesus Christ. The Kingdom of God, according to Christ, is a spiritual order which men enter by means of the miracle of the new birth. The Marxian principle "from each to each" is the core of the totalitarian system in which men serve the interests and whims of the state instead of serving the living God.
>
> This social gospel distortion of the Biblical teaching concerning God's Kingdom flows from the underlying theological error of Dr. E. Stanley Jones, as found in his many books. We therefore urge Christians of Asia to avoid fellowship with churches who invite Dr. E. Stanley Jones to exercise the teaching ministry in their meetings.

The Far Eastern Council of Christian Churches reaches an adverse conclusion regarding Jones' identification of the two doctrines of brotherly love — one, the traditional Christian doctrine, and the other, the communist doctrine. The F. E. C. C. C. objects to that identification. PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM also objects. The Council does not give its detailed reasons for deservedly opposing the E. Stanley Jones position. Exactly what the argument or evidence is of the Council against the ideas of E. Stanley Jones we do not know. Neither do we know whether the Council would agree with the argument we are here presenting. But regardless of reasons, the Council and PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM come to the same result and we salute the correct conclusion of the Far Eastern Council of Christian Churches relative to the brotherly love and social ideas of Dr. E. Stanley Jones.

The same Council also passed a"Resolution on the Message of T. Kagawa," which is as follows:

> Whereas, there is in the Far East today a great confusion as to what the Christian message really is, due to the ceaseless propagandizing and wide acceptance by undiscerning Christendom of some church leaders whose message is a far departure from Biblical Christianity.

> *Be it resolved,* that the Far Eastern Council of Christian Churches' second biennial convention, meeting in Karuizawa, Japan, warn the Christian public of Japan and the whole Far East that the message of Toyohiko Kagawa, which identifies the Biblical Kingdom of God with a modern cooperative social order, is not the Christian message, and that it is being proclaimed by a man who denies the true deity of our Lord Jesus Christ and the full truthfulness of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. The preaching of the so-called "social gospel" as a substitute for the Bible's individual Gospel of personal salvation through faith in Jesus Christ and His redemption, is a tragic substitution in which a message which is completely foreign to the teaching of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, is presented in His name. Furthermore, we greatly deplore the new translation of the New Testament which was recently published by Mr. Kagawa as its editor. This New Testament is sure to do great damage to the Christian public, containing as it does in its Introduction a denial of the apostolic origin of the Gospel of John and Matthew and various of the epistles of Paul, Peter, Jude and John. Placing the origin of portions of the New Testament in the second century cannot be substantiated, and is an attack upon the inspiration of and value of the Scriptures. It should be resisted.

The foregoing quotation from resolutions by the Far Eastern Council of Christian Churches is taken from *The Reformation Review,* January, 1954, pages 55 and 56.

On February 1, 1951, the World Council of Churches sent out a letter to all member churches reading:

> The peoples have seen the vision of social justice. It is for us to help transform it into reality. All people in privileged countries — particularly Christians — must strive to enter sympathetically into the social DEMANDS

> of the needy. FROM EACH ACCORDING TO HIS ABILITY AND TO EACH ACCORDING TO HIS NEEDS, HAS ITS ROOTS IN THE TEACHING OF JESUS CHRIST. (Emphasis supplied.)

We have quoted the ideas of two famous missionary leaders and a letter of the World Council of Churches. They associate the welfare of men, and the very essence of the Christian gospel, with certain ideas on brotherly love and on the social order, which tie together the acceptance of the Christian gospel (so-called) with the social structure of communism.

We do not, of course, declare that either E. Stanley Jones or Kagawa approves the notorious methods of communism — violence, coercion, oppression, murder, assassination. We say merely that they approve the *basic principle* of communism, from each according to his ability to each according to his need. It is *that* objective, *that* principle which is the *real* issue between communism and Christianity. The atheism of communism is not its really relevant characteristic as is perfectly clear from the fact that the men who have just been quoted are not atheists.

It is indeed a great error to hold that so-called orthodox Christians do not concur on this issue with the E. Stanley Joneses or the Kagawas or the World Council. We quote again the professor* in economics at the Free University in Amsterdam which considers itself orthodox. He writes (translated):

> The big mistake of socialism is that it pursues a high moral [*sic!*] principle [from each according to his ability to each according to his need] by immoral means, yea even with spiritual coercion.

Possibly not one protest has even been voiced by anyone in the Reformed churches of The Netherlands against the statement of Vander Kooy just quoted. Possibly not one protest will ever be voiced by a responsible leader in sister denominations throughout the world.

*Dr. T. P. Vander Kooy, of the Department of Economic and Social Sciences, in *Op het Grensgebred van Economie en Religie* (On the Borderland Between Economics and Religion).

In fact, if Christian "witnessing" is an evidence of what the various orthodox Calvinist denominations think in this age about the famous communist rule on brotherly love, from each according to his ability to each according to his need, then the general *absence* of critical "witnessing" is conclusive proof that the communist principle is accepted or at least is not considered dangerous nor a principle to be contradicted or fought.

Typical of the wide acceptance in liberal Christian churches of the communist law of love are the statements and activities of the Committee on Social Action in the Congregational churches.

Therefore, this conclusion is in order. Many if not most religious leaders, both liberal and orthodox, genuinely identify the communist law of love with the Christian law of love; that is, for them the two statements are identical, the traditional Christian one, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, and the traditional socialist-communist one, from each according to his ability to each according to his need.

How Do Christian Leaders Accomplish Identification of the Two Laws of Love?

How do both orthodox and liberal Christians accomplish an identification of the Christian law of love, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, with the socialist-communist law of love, from each according to his ability to each according to his need?

That question fascinates us. *How* arrive at the erroneous conclusion that Christianity teaches, regarding the relations of men to men, the same thing that Marx, Lenin, Hitler, Stalin, Mussolini (all of them basically socialists) taught, namely, that the right relations between men require a social order described by the socialist-communist law of love, from each according to his ability to each according to his need?

The answer is very simple. A limited requirement to love the neighbor was changed to an unlimited requirement. A natural and reasonable and psychologically sound requirement to love the neighbor was changed to an unnatural and unreasonable and psychologically unsound requirement to love the neighbor. A sincere relation between men as prescribed by Biblical ethics became a

hyper-pious, sanctimonious, sickening relation. Socialism-communism had literally out-done Christianity in its demands for love between men. Socialist-communists were like politicians who had out-promised the politicians in the opposite party. There appeared to be nothing for Christians to do other than to alter their definition of brotherly love so that it would promise as much as the socialist-communist law of love. Political demagogues compete with each other in making ever greater and greater promises. The clergy and the socialists-communists have engaged in a similar competition — an extending of the law of love between man to infinity. This is wholly contrary to Scripture. Scripture speaks of a potential infinite love between Creator and creature. But nowhere (as has been shown) does it speak of an infinite love between man and man.

Modern leaders of the Christian church have led the church into a trap. Competition from the socialists-communists has brought the church from sincerity to insincerity, from realism to sanctimony, from wholesome ethics to vicious ethics, from wisdom to folly.

The Principle of Extension as Known to Logicians

The ridiculous thing about the action of the teachers of so-called Christian ethics is that they were not run into a trap but that they ran into it themselves of their own accord.

In a free-for-all argument the thing that is sometimes attempted is to run an opponent into a trap. Schopenhauer in his essay on "The Art of Controversy" advises that you "extend" your opponent's argument. He wrote regarding this dialectical trick in order to win an argument regardless of honesty, as follows:

> The Extension. This consists in carrying your opponent's proposition beyond its natural limits; in giving it as general a signification and as wide a sense as possible, so as to exaggerate it; and, on the other hand, in giving your own propostion as restricted a sense and as narrow limits as you can, because the more general a statement becomes, the more numerous are the objections to which it is open.

If someone, therefore, in an argument about how much the neighbor should be loved had followed the policy of stretching and extending more and more demandingly the requirements for loving the neighbor he would certainly finally have his opponent trapped in an "extension" which would be fantastic and fatal to the opponent. Then, after getting his opponent "out-on-a-limb" the limb could be sawed off by a little common-sense argument. In an absurd manner many religious leaders have climbed far out on a limb in regard to the demand for brotherly love. It is time that they climb back before the limb is sawed off.

The "Extension" Itself; the Pseudo-Christian Doctrine of Brotherly Love

The reader is now referred to the diagram which appears on page 123. This diagram summarizes what will be elaborated in the following text.

The following may be briefly noted:

1. The scriptural definition sets the individual himself as the general standard; the nonscriptural definition sets the group collectively as the alleged standard, or the neighbor distributively as the standard.

2. The five specific items included in the scriptural definition have been explained in detail in the earlier instalments, and none of that will be repeated.

3. The scriptural definition provides for a *voluntary* society, that is, a society in which its coercive arm (the state) limits its activity to the resistance of evil. The nonscriptural definition provides for a *coercive* society, that is, a society in which its coercive arm (the state) extends its activity to the alleged endeavor of doing more for the so-called public good than resistance to evil.

4. The several specific items included in the nonscriptural definition will be elaborated upon in what follows.

5. The unwarranted "extension" of the meaning of the law of brotherly love to include what is in the right-hand section of the diagram constitutes the means by which religious leaders

Two Definitions of the Famous Law, Thou Shalt Love Thy Neighbor As Thyself

The Scriptural Definition

A Voluntary Society

INDIVIDUALISM

(yourself as the standard)

	Goodwill			
No harm to the neighbor	Forebearance and forgiveness	Goodwill or beneficent attitude toward neighbor	Charity	Declaration of the gospel to the neighbor
(objective)	(objective)	(subjective)	(objective)	(objective)

The un-Biblical and fatal-to-society extension of the scriptural law of brotherly love consists in extending the definition from what is on this side of the line . . .

The Anti-Scriptural Definition

A Coercive Society

COLLECTIVISM

(the neighbor collectively as the standard, or distributively among all neighbors)

Voluntary Collectivism or one hundred percent charity — The New Agape Religion	Coercion		
	Coerced Receiving	Coerced Giving	Mental Coercion
	The arrogance underlying this	Forced sharing or egalitarianism, that is, from each according to his ability to each according to his need	Must avoid hurting a neighbor's feelings
(objective and subjective)	(objective)	(objective)	(subjective)

. . . to include also what is on this side. The effect of this is that what is provided on this side of that line nullifies what is on the other side of the line. The extension is therefore not merely an extension, but also in its effects a destroyer.

have seemingly been able to identify the Hebrew-Christian law of love with the really antithetical communist law of love.

We proceed to a more-detailed description of the ideas in the right-hand section of the diagram.

Voluntary Collectivism

If collectivism was not hypocrisy it would be possible to find at least a limited number of people who *voluntarily* practiced *full-fledged* collectivism. Such people cannot be found. They have never been found. They will never be found.

People will make great sacrifices at times and for certain individuals, but they will not make egalitarian (equalizing) sacrifices all the time nor for everybody. Genuine collectivism requires just that; egalitarianism for everybody all the time.

The churches send missionaries to far countries where the standard of living is much lower. No denomination expects its missionaries to reduce their standard of living to that of the native population. And none does. If it were required it would be impossible to get enough candidates for mission work. If a man might think he had the fortitude for it, his wife would rebel. If his wife did not rebel, father and mother both would object to their children being subjected to such conditions. To teach egalitarian Christianity as a missionary is to be patently inconsistent with one's own life as a missionary. That is one of several reasons why missionaries from the Occident are no longer wanted in the Orient. Egalitarianism is often taught as a standard but is never lived as a standard. If egalitarianism is *the* right system according to the proclamation, then why do not the missionaries personally and completely practice it? We do not criticize them for non-egalitarianism in living; we do criticize them for teaching egalitarianism.

In his busy retirement the founder of a world-wide business travelled through the Orient. He published some of his observations. One of them was that in China a missionary (in former days) was a very privileged man, with a person more sacred from restraints than any other foreigner. Further, that the missionaries were able to live in grand style because the purchasing power of

their salary was in China far greater than it would be in the United States. They occupied some of the best dwellings; they employed servants; in the season they visited the resorts with the best climate, etc. This shrewd gentleman's observation was that the situation for missionaries was the reverse of what might be expected. The missionaries' standard of living was not between that of a correspondingly situated person in the States and the natives; instead, it was above that of the correspondingly situated person in the States. We see nothing wrong with that. However, the fact is in the reverse direction from egalitarianism.

But it is a mistake to preach egalitarianism and not to live it.

Christ himself was not egalitarian. Surely, he condemned wealth obtained by coercion and fraud. Surely, he required charity (in the Hebrew sense). But he did not at any time call for any complete levelling. And, of course, if a complete levelling is permissible or desirable one time, then repeated acts of levelling are equally permissible and desirable. The result of that would be the discouragement of thrift and industry, and the spread of poverty and idleness.

Christ declared he had no property, no place to lay his head. But he associated extensively with people of means or with fair connections, the sons of Zebedee for example; and with Lazarus, Martha and Mary, who probably were not "proletarians." Christ had a garment without seams, obviously valuable. If he were an egalitarian why did he not give it away, or why did he not discourage its production so that two or three cheaper garments might have been made in its stead? Further, not only was he not egalitarian in his dress, but he was also not egalitarian in his eating. The Pharisees called him a glutton and a winebibber, which undoubtedly was defamation. But there is no reason to believe that Christ had a poor fare and did not eat and drink better than the poorest of the Hebrews of his day.

Egalitarianism is not a suitable method for equalizing the property of the very rich and the very poor. The rich man became rich either dishonestly or honestly. If he obtained his wealth in violation of the law, he should be prosecuted under the law as a criminal. That is in such a case the proper correction. If the rich man obtained his wealth by thrift and labor and by service to

the public voluntarily paid for by the public, why take away from him what he has come by honestly according to the law of God and the corresponding law of men (if it is corresponding)?

This argument against egalitarianism is not merely scriptural, but it is also economic and can stand autonomous of Scripture and be independent of scriptural authority. In subsequent issues of Progressive Calvinism various examples of internal inconsistency in egalitarianism will be developed which will discredit any claim it has to credibility.

Machiavelli declared that a prince (a ruler of a people) could have a fairly secure tenure as ruler if he did not disturb his subjects in regard (1) to their property or (2) to their women. But if such a prince conducted himself so that his subjects were inadequately protected against him in regard to their property or women then sooner or later there would be a conspiracy against him to remove or destroy him.

Machiavelli's observation appears profound and unchallengeable. But his manner of speech (which in his case was wholly permissible) hides a fundamental fact. He might as well have said a prince needed to leave his subjects undisturbed in legitimate possession of property. Period. It was not necessary to add the women. The reason for this is that women are only one form of property. Machiavelli mentions them separately only because they are such an important form of property.

Nothing disrespectful of women is meant by the foregoing. A man's wife is his property. The corresponding statement for a woman is that a woman's husband is her property. Machiavelli might well have said if he were thinking of a princess (a female ruler as distinguished from a prince) that she would be secure in her tenure as ruler if she left the property of her subjects and their husbands alone. Otherwise, she could confidently be expected to be poisoned (or something) by the irate women in her country.

Men do not "love" women because they are all so remarkable. A man loves a wife because she has given him possession of her. He tells her sweet things and she believes them, but he would not tell them to her if she were not his *possession*. And vice versa.

Men do not treat unfortunate prostitutes as they treat their wives. Men will not protect *public* property but only *private* property in things and in women. A man will not support a prostitute. A wife will not (ordinarily) keep a philandering husband, or if she keeps him she is doing it for practical reasons (subsistence, position or children) and is acutely unhappy about the philandering.

The *essential* requirement that a girl must meet (really or at least apparently) to get and hold a husband is that she will genuinely and permanently belong to him alone. And to nobody else. And vice versa.

It is *possession* which gives happiness, and not beauty or intelligence or charm. Men have incapacity to wish to keep unfaithful mates. Women have an equal incapacity to wish to keep unfaithful mates.

A conclusion follows from all this. It is this. To be consistent the egalitarians must make wives and husbands common property as well as things.

All utopists, all outliners of an "ideal" society, a voluntary collectivism, all of them make women *common* property. Consider Plato, or Fourier, or the full-fledged ideas of the socialists. See August Bebel's *Die Frau und der Socialismus.*

Indeed, the consistent voluntary collectivists, the egalitarians, the utopists, the people who say that the claims of the neighbor are valid, all these must share women as well as things. On this point, however, the religious moralists with a background in Hebrew-Christian ethics have not yet become fully consistent. They recoil from *that* application of their *principle.*

There is, in conclusion, no sincere egalitarianism anywhere. Deeds never match fine words on egalitarianism. Where egalitarianism is taught with the appearance of sincerity it is a self-delusion. And further, egalitarianism is not an effective solution of the so-called problem of inequality of wealth.

Any professed moral standard, the observance of which is as far away from reality as *voluntary* collectivism is, should be set aside as impractical and sanctimonious.

The Popular Religion of Agape

Agape (ag' a pe) is one of the Greek words in the New Testament translated both as *love* or as *charity*. That it has been translated both ways illustrates the difficulty of giving its exact meaning. Consider how the translators of the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians have floundered between *love* and *charity* when translating *agape* in that chapter.

The "development" of the idea of *agape* has resulted, we believe, in a new religion wholly different from Christianity. We would, therefore, when considering what follows have the reader keep in mind, Christianity VERSUS *agape*. In short, the new agape religion is *not* the Christian religion, and it is not reconcilable with the *traditional* Christian religion.

Bishop Anders Nygren has written a book entitled, *Agape and Eros*. Bishop Nygren is one of the two famous theologians at the state-supported Lutheran Theological school in Lund, Sweden, who have made world-renowned what is known as the Lund school of religious thought. On the Continent the two modern best-known Protestant schools of thought are the Barthian and the Lund.

Nygren carefully and systematically develops his main thesis, namely, that there are two main ideas on *love* in Christian thought, the one *eros* and the other *agape*. A third and minor one is *Nomos*, man's fulfilling of the Law. Nygren rejects the *eros* and even more so the *Nomos* concepts of love. Christianity for him consists in acceptance of his *agape* definition and the identification of Christianity with the accomplishment of that definition of love.

Eros will to all who know Greek mean sensual sex appetite. But Nygren (following Plato) has the term defined more broadly, namely, as selfish, or self-seeking, or self-benefiting and self-satisfying desire. The desire a man has for a mate is a specific case of a self-satisfying desire or love. It is a love motivated by self-satisfying considerations. It is a low form of *eros*. A high form of *eros* would be a self-seeking love toward God.

But if a man loved a woman not for possession but solely for her welfare; if his "love" was unmotivated by any inclination for

self-gratification and regardless of her merit as an object to be loved then it would be *agape.*

Eros, for Nygren, is essentially the human love for the divine, a love of man for God. *Eros* is an appetite, a yearning desire, which is aroused by the attractive qualities of its object; and in eros-love man seeks God in order to satisfy his spiritual hunger by the possession and enjoyment of the divine perfections. In such a "love" there is an alloy of "selfishness." It is not a high love. Agape is the love above all selfishness.

Nygren himself writes that:

1. *Agape* is spontaneous and "unmotivated"
2. *Agape* is "indifferent to value"
3. *Agape* is creative [creates value by loving]
4. *Agape* is the initiator of fellowship with God . . . *Agape* is God's way to man.

From what has been written or quoted the reader will realize at once that Nygren's views and the views presented in Progressive Calvinism are wholly irreconcilable. What we call love, Nygren would consider the opposite of *agape.* What we call love would hardly for him be *eros.* What we call love would probably be in his estimation a combination of a low-grade *eros* with a strong mixture of *Nomos,* a relationship to God which essentially requires a wish to be obedient to the law.

Nygren has performed a great work. He has shown what the basic premises are which must underlie a definition of love which is wholly non-self-regarding. Those premises, however, unavoidably involve:

1. Universalism. God loves the sinner as much as the non-sinner. The object does not influence the manifestation of love. There is no real place whatever for reprobation, as an attitude of God, in Nygren's scheme of thought.

2. The creation of "objective" values, as distinguished from "subjective" values. This latter difference is so fundamental it cannot be more than mentioned here. It requires wholly special treatment.

A by-product of Nygren's definition of *Agape* is that he is constrained to declare the Christianity of the New Testament to be different *in principle* from the religion of the Old Testament.

We have then in the Nygrenian ideas an extremely extended definition of love in a manner to reject all validity to self-regarding evaluations and motivations and actions. This is setting up that which is external to the individual as having a unique claim on him. Nothing could be a better theoretical justification for the socialist-communist law of love in the field of positive action, from each according to his ability to each according to his need, than this *agape* religion of Nygren.

Nygren's definition of *agape* requires man to do so much that beyond doubt Nygren has outlined the most idealistic religion of love that has yet been formulated. We consider it so idealistic that it is unnatural, inhuman, unattainable, and impossible *ex definitione*.

Nygren's influence on the definition given to love among theologians generally has been enormous and pervasive. The ideas expressed in lectures of Dr. Henry Stob of Calvin Theological Seminary manifest, for example, affinity to the ideas of Nygren. In the paper presented by Stob at the International Congress for Reformed Faith and Action at Montpelier, France, in 1953, he commented on the deficiencies in Plato's idea of love along the lines of Nygren.

> . . . More basically still, they [Plato and Aristotle] had no experience of that Love without which true communion is impossible — the Divine Agape, God's love for sinful and unworthy man. The best they knew was Eros, a self-initiated attachment to what was considered good and valuable. But this from the nature of the case, could not be exercised upon the ignorant, the wicked and the ugly, and thus large numbers were excluded in principle from human fellowship, and authentic community was never achieved.

Stob's evaluation of Plato and Aristotle is accepted, but the standard for love which is implied is the same extension that Nygren makes to which we dissent. We cannot find acceptable

either the logic or the conclusion. True communion is possible, and only possible, if the definition in the left of the chart is employed. No real communion whatever is possible when a definition of love is given which underlies the social systems outlined in the right side of the chart.

The Coercion of Recipients

When mention is made of a coercive society the idea is usually taken to mean that someone is being coerced to *do* or *give* something. But the assumption is too restrictive. A coercive society can also consist of individuals being coerced to *accept* something. This idea of an obligation to accept something may appear to be above criticism, but it is not. The Biblical law of love cannot be extended to include coerced acceptance any more than coerced giving. Understanding of the objections to coerced acceptance is relatively rare.

An idea may be prejudiced by giving it an unfavorable setting. We shall do just the contrary, and we shall examine this phase of the violation of the Biblical law of love under the most favorable circumstances.

We shall consider a not infrequent case, a certain type mother and her family.

Imagine a woman with a husband and three children. Assume a natural and wholesome relationship, genuine affection throughout the family. See that family in historical perspective — newly established, growing, children dependent, children maturing, parents aging, children marrying, grandchildren arriving, the original father and mother failing and dying.

During the minority of the children the parents make the decisions for the children in proportion as the age of the children makes them irresponsible. But eventually the children mature; they become independent; they may become rebels toward the parents; or they may continue in the path of the earlier parental guidance, but they now do it on their own.

Indefinite continuance of parental authority or guidance becomes oppressive and eventually obnoxious to the children. As

psychologists know, children who do not become independent of their parents never amount to anything. An essential hallmark of maturity in man and beast is that the young eventually set out on their own.

But in our assumed case the mother cannot outgrow her early responsibilities. She was once obligated to sacrifice comfort and her own inclinations in order to care for, protect and rear the children.

The mother insists on continuing the old pattern for manifesting her love. The children come home to visit. She wishes them to eat what she specifies and how much. They *must* have another helping of food at meals. Their clothes are examined and they are not warm enough; more must be worn. They must be tucked in again in bed at night. They cannot be too active on their vacation or they will not get enough rest.

What is the reaction of the recipients of all this mothering attention? Suppose they accept it as a matter of course and let their mother slave for them. Nobody will think much of them. Or maybe they will tolerate it a little just to please the mother, but beyond a certain point they rebel — they refuse to accept it any more. And then there may be the final clash — the children refuse to let an aging and failing mother overexert herself for what is unnecessary and, worse still, is unpleasant. Finally, they put their foot down — no more overloading of plates with food, no more pampering against every breath of air, no more anxiety about sleeping warm.

Why do the children put a stop to the expression of love which the mother wishes to show? They object for two reasons: (1) they consider it unfair to their mother, and (2) they do not have the same sense of "values" that their mother has. They do not wish to do what their mother endeavors to impose on them. They have their own "values."

The mother is, in fact, imposing *her* sense of values on *them.* When the children were small it was necessary to impose her sense of values on them. But as responsible human beings they are now interested in ordering their life according to their own sense of values; they do not wish to overeat; they do not wish to wear

enervating clothing; they do not care that the bed clothes are not tucked in well.

Now assume the mother insists. What does such insistence reveal? Basically, it reveals arrogance. She "knows better" than her grown-up children what is good for them! Her judgment is, she considers, better than the judgment of her mature children. We judge her gently and understandingly. But nobody really approves of her attitude.

In a simple case as outlined everybody understands that to make somebody a coerced recipient is unwise and finally wrong, that is, evil. Any definition of love, therefore, which permits coercing the wishes of a recipient is evil; sin. (The exception, of course, are the irresponsible recipients — the minors, the mentally deficient, etc.)

A good law of love, therefore, protects an unwilling recipient as well as it protects an unwilling giver.

When mothers or fathers, or the wise, or the powerful, or the good or the wicked, set out to impose their "values" on others, thereby denying each individual his right to pursue his own values then the recipient of those imposed, coerced values is no longer loved as Scripture clearly teaches we should love the neighbor. According to Scripture there is only *one* type of coercion permitted, namely, the coercion which consists in resisting the evils prohibited by the Decalogue.

To go beyond that is to do just the reverse of what Scripture teaches.

The Greeks had a word for a type of arrogance, namely, for overweaning arrogance, for insufferable arrogance. Their word for that arrogance was *hubris* (hew′ bris). To impose your "values" on your neighbor is a hubris.

The only being who could properly be considered to be authorized to have such a hubris, to regulate every man's choice and values, is an omniscient being, that is, God. But the God of the Hebrew-Christian religion did just the reverse of that — he made man free in his choices and values. Adam was set up as a *free* man. Adam departed from the command of God of his own free will. (The character of that deviation is worthy of special analysis.)

But our illustration from mother "love" embellishes the real character of coercing recipients. Who are the usual coercers — doting mothers and fathers? friends? brothers and sisters? No, the coercers of recipients are usually complete strangers who know only a few individuals and look at men in the mass. They do not know the mass in any real sense whatever. Certainly, they do not know mankind *en masse* as well as the mother in our illustration knows her three children. And neither do they really "love" mankind *en masse* as this mother "loves" her three children. Lacking both the mother's love and knowledge, the coercers of recipients would regulate the lives of mankind as if those who regulate were genuinely wise and genuinely virtuous. A feeble human intellect, with only a short span of activity in this life, is to impose its "values" on the mass of men. It is a hubris, a damnable piece of arrogance, a pretense of being wiser than God.

Basically, behind the improper extension of the law of love beyond the scriptural definition is an epistemological error and hubris. Epistemology concerns itself with the range and limits of the human mind. What *can* a man's mind know? To think any finite being *can* have values so universally applicable to all men as to justify imposing those values on all men is to be epistemologically as far away from Calvinism (with its acceptance of the doctrine of total depravity) as it is possible to be. Calvinism sets a low value on man's native wisdom and goodness. To adopt a broader, an extended, law of love which consists in imposing your own values on your neighbor, is to approach the whole of life wrongly — arrogantly. You are setting out to do more than God apparently set out to do.

But the case still has been represented unrealistically. We have considered an extended "love" from a doting mother toward three children, and then an extended "love" of *well-intentioned* people towards the millions who constitute mankind and whose individual values those well-intentioned few cannot possibly know, and by whom it is a hubris to think they *can* know. But who are the people who *really* constitute the coercers of recipients in modern society? They are socialists and communists — the greatest butchers and tyrants in all history — the Lenins and Stalins, the Hitlers and Mussolinis. It is the men who are notoriously evil who insist

on impossing their values on mankind. They come as if they were as harmless as sheep, but they are wolves in sheep's clothing. Knowledge of that idea is not limited to those acquainted with Scripture. The great political philosophers have learned from history that the path pursued by most tyrants is the path of pretended love and the imposing of the good on everybody. Nearly all tyrants begin by pretending to a love beyond what Scripture teaches.

Alexander Hamilton and his associates when founding the United States understood the foregoing very well. In the first of *The Federalist Papers* Hamilton wrote:

> *. . . a dangerous ambition more often lurks behind the specious mask of zeal for the rights of the people than under the forbidding appearance of zeal for the firmness of government.* History will teach us that the former has been found a much more certain road to the introduction of despotism than the latter, and that of those men who have overturned the liberties of republics, the greatest number have begun their career by paying an obsequious court to the people; commencing demagogues and ending tyrants. (Emphasis supplied.)

We would paraphrase Hamilton and make a parallel statement: History will teach us that extending the Biblical law of love by making it require more than Scripture requires has been found a much more certain road for the introduction of heterodox ideas than the commonsense interpretation of Biblical rules, and that of the men who have subverted the vitality of religion the greatest number began their career by interpreting the law of love so that it became sanctimonious; commencing with sanctimony the church ended with hyprocrisy.

Let us now turn to that extension of the law of love which involves coercing the givers, as distinguished from the recipients.

The Coercion of Givers

Our original illustration of overextended mother-love continues to give an unduly favorable impression of the real situation. The mother in our illustration was giving her mature children a second

helping of food while her own first helping was getting cold on her plate; she was insisting on her daughter wearing the mother's rubbers and the mother's feet got wet; she was walking over cold floors to tuck the blankets around her son already fast asleep and comfortably warm. All this was *at her own expense.*

But when the extenders of the law of love began to impose their values on all mankind there was a basic change in the situation. The do-gooders were not imposing their wishes on all others at their own expense. Indeed not. Their whole program depended as much on coercing givers as on coercing recipients. The values of the do-gooders, of the extenders of the law of love, were imposed on both recipients and givers.

(We have already covered in sufficient detail the chaos which would result from a distributive imposition of *A*'s values on *B, C, D, E,* etc.; and of *B*'s values on *A, C, D, E,* etc.; and of *C*'s values on *A, B, D, E,* etc. See pages 69 and 70 of the March issue of Progressive Calvinism. By "distributive imposition" we mean the imposition of *individualistic* claims by each man on each other man. To distribute such individual claims or values among mankind is a manifest intellectual absurdity. The claims of the neighbor, the imposition of his values, therefore, always becomes collective. The finite human mind, arrogantly overdefining brotherly love, cannot deal with individuals anymore; it deals only with men as a mass.)

The basic characteristic of the coercion of the recipients has been described as being arrogance. The basic characteristic of the coercion of the givers is hypocrisy. The neighbor is "loved" (beyond the scriptural command) at the expense of a third person. *A* "loves" *B,* that is, he imposes his values on *B.* But the cost of the imposition on *B* of those values *A* assesses against *C, D, E, F,* and all others. *A* is simply generous with what belongs to somebody else, in this case the values of *C, D, E, F,* etc. This, of course, cannot be considered "love" by any kind of definition. But it passes for love and is always called pure love — agape — by the extenders of the Biblical law of love. The mother in our illustration was after all not a hypocrite.

All coercive imposition of values on recipient or giver is sin. It involves not only arrogance and hypocrisy but also other ob-

noxious violations of the commandments. A favorite goal of most of those who extend the Biblical definition of the law of love is equality. This never means to them equality in the rules for the game of life but equality in the end result. This is very clear from the statement of their law of love, from each according to his ability to each according to his need. The need is generally estimated to be the same for all. That means equality in the end result. But clearly the law assumes differences in ability and the law states that greater ability imposes the obligation to make a greater contribution.

Equality in the end result is therefore not to be obtained by equality in the rules or in general opportunity. No, equality in the end result is to be obtained by inequality in the rules of the game.

There *cannot,* indeed, be equality both in the rules and in the end result. It is either equality in the rules and inequality in the end result; OR, there must be inequality in the rules and equality in the end result.

When placed on the horns of that dilemma Scripture chooses for equality in the rules and tolerates (encourages) inequality in the end result. But the Reinhold Niebuhrs and the others who have an extended definition of the law of love choose contrarily. They choose for equality in the end results and inequality in the rules. And the best-known Calvinist colleges and universities in the world choose with Niebuhr.

Scripture has some harsh comments about those who have different rules for playing the game of life — one rule for one man and another rule for another man. And about the most infrequent word in Scripture is the word, equality. Justice, in contrast, is a common word; it always implies *uniform rules.*

Scripture, therefore, cannot be used as an authority for declaring that *differing* rules should prevail in order to attain a uniform end or equality in the end result.

Mental Coercion

The coercion of the neighbor either in receiving or giving is not restricted to the material world; in practice the coercion of the

neighbor involved in the socialist-communist law of love is always extended to include a *mental* coercion as well. That is because *coercion* is an unavoidable concomitant to the socialist-communist law of love.

The extension of the law of love to justify *mental* coercion is spontaneous and slips into a given situation unnoticed and unchallenged. The extension to which we refer consists in this: the law of love requires that you may not hurt your neighbor's feelings; you may not show you disapprove of anything about him; you should endeavor to like what he likes. You must have "authentic community" with him.

Scripture teaches none of these ideas. We are nowhere taught in Scripture not to hurt a man's feelings; we are not required by Scripture to be silent about things we disapprove about him; we are not told to have the same tastes or the same likes and dislikes. All these requirements involved in the socialist-communist law of love as it is always interpreted, or must be interpreted if its professors are to be consistent — all these requirements are extra-scriptural.

Dr. Henry C. Link, in a book entitled *Rediscovery of Morals**, tells of the action, under the guidance of Elias Lieberman, associate superintendent of New York City junior high schools, of a committee of students for drawing up a code of moral conduct. The first rule in the code reads:

> I will never, knowingly, by word or deed, injure anyone's person, *feelings* or property in any manner. (Emphasis supplied.)

These students, undoubtedly under the influence of their advisors and of the spirit of the age, added what has not been in any famous ancient code, namely, you may "never . . . knowingly . . . injure anyone's . . . feelings." This fine-sounding rule covers an enormous area; note the words *never* and *anyone's*. Aside from the rule being expressed in too-extended and too-demanding terms, the really significant extension in it is the result of the inclusion of the word *feelings*.

In the first place this inclusion prohibits all deliberate, and well-intended, but realistic criticism. No one can be "corrected"

*Page 158

anymore if it is anticipated his *feelings* will be hurt. And most people's feelings are genuinely hurt by the mildest of criticism. Scripture, in contrast, does not give attention to the problem of people's feelings being hurt.

Secondly, the right of individual *choices* is also denied by this "rule" of junior high school students. Jacob, Scripture relates, did not like Leah as well as Rachel. The reason given is that Leah had "tender eyes" which probably means they were bleared, and unhandsome and maybe inefficient. Anyway, Jacob did not like them. And his dislike was not secret; he made his taste in the matter of eyes known. Was Jacob in this instance a sinner? It is ridiculous to affirm it. How pervasive, however, the idea is that you may not hurt people's feelings is indicated in the statement of Dr. Henry Stob, previously quoted:

> . . . but this [*eros*, as a self-initiated attachment to what was considered good and valuable] from the nature of the case, could not be exercised upon the ignorant, the wicked or the ugly, and thus large numbers were excluded in principle from human fellowship, and authentic community was never achieved.

Dr. Stob together with the junior high school committee denies the rightfulness of exercising one's own choice — you must like the ignorant, the wicked, and the ugly as you do the wise and the good and the beautiful, or otherwise you have excluded "large numbers . . . in principle from human fellowship, and authentic community [is] never achieved."

These new legislators, whether junior high school students or Nygren, do a very simple thing — they restrict the legitimate exercise of one's own choices to those choices which will not hurt the neighbor's feelings. We have here the unwarranted extension of the scriptural law of love, which looks innocent enough: your neighbors, all of them, individually and/or collectively, have a claim on you, namely, their choices and wishes can override yours. If you do not substitute the neighbor's choices and feelings for your own, then you do not "love" him, you do not have *agape*.

There are, probably in the opinion of some, certain characteristics which a neighbor may have (which you may not like) regard-

ing which you may not show him that you do not like them. The type of characteristics to which reference is made is the type which consists of *uncorrectable* defects — namely, defects due to heredity, environment, or generally the "providence of God." Poor Leah had such an uncorrectable defect, tender eyes; Jacob *should* have liked those tender eyes as well as a pair of handsome eyes! Nevertheless, we do not consider him a sinner in the matter. The infinite variety in creation justifies selectivity, choice, likes and dislikes. And when a law is extended piously, that you may not exercise *your own* choices but must suppress them *to please* others then the scriptural law has been turned upside down. You have substituted collectivism for individualism, a group for the individual, coercion for liberty.

The general subject of the right of discrimination in the varied universe in which we live is worthy of separate treatment, which is intended in later issues of PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM.

John Calvin on Freedom Versus Tyranny

John Calvin had something to say about the neighbor lording it over a man by insisting that the feelings, opinions, choices, wishes or needs of the neighbor should prevail rather than a man's own feelings, opinions, choices, wishes or needs. Calvin wrote a chapter in his *Institutes* which has the title, "Christian Liberty" (*Institutes,* Book III, Chapter 19). The ideas in this chapter are not couched in modern language, but they are simple. They are:

1. *Get rid of your guilt complexes,* or in Calvin's language, the "consciences of believers should raise themselves above the law, and forget the righteousness of the law."

2. *Stop thinking of the law as essentially prohibitions but think of it as an opportunity for real living* (as was outlined in PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM beginning on page 62 of the March issue), or in Calvin's language, the "consciences, being free of the law, yield a voluntary obedience to the will of God."

3. Each man can do what HE HIMSELF PLEASES and not according to what pleases the neighbor, or in Calvin's language, "we are bound by no obligation before God respecting

external things, which in themselves are indifferent, but that we may indifferently sometimes use and at other times omit them."

Calvin teaches (1) freedom from a guilty conscience, (2) freedom in the great area beyond the restrictions of the Decalogue, and (3) freedom from the tyranny of the neighbor, i. e., three great freedoms.

The tyranny of the neighbor Calvin treats specifically under a subheading pertaining to "offenses." He considers offenses of two kinds, "offenses given" and "offenses taken." The "offenses given" are offenses which trouble spiritually weak neighbors. Calvin warns against giving such offenses. But the other offenses he considers "offenses taken" and he advises deliberately flouting them. Quoting Calvin:

> . . . I approve of the common distinction between an offense given and an offense taken, since it is plainly countenanced by Scripture, and is likewise sufficiently significant of the thing intended to be expressed. If you do anything at a wrong time or place, or with an unseasonable levity, or wantonness, or temerity, by which the weak and inexperienced are offended, it must be termed an offense given by you; because it arises from your fault. And an offense is always said to be given in any action the fault of which proceeds from the performer of that action. An offense taken is when any transaction, not otherwise unseasonable or culpable, is, through malevolence or some perverse disposition, construed into an occasion of offense. For in this instance the offense is not given, but taken without reason by such perverseness of construction. The first species of offense affects none but the weak; the second is created by moroseness of temper and Pharisaical superciliousness. Wherefore we shall denominate the former "the offense of the weak," the latter, that "of Pharisees"! and we shall so temper the use of our liberty that it ought to submit to the ignorance of weak brethren, but not at all to the austerity of Pharisees . . .

> Now, since the consciences of believers, being privileged with the liberty which we have described, have been delivered by the favor of Christ from all necessary obligation to the observance of those things in which the Lord has been pleased they should be left free, WE CONCLUDE THAT THEY ARE EXEMPT FROM ALL HUMAN AUTHORITY. (Emphasis supplied.)

There is a wide gulf between those who say we may "never . . . knowingly . . . injure anyone's . . . feelings" and Calvin who said "exempt from all human authority."

A Voluntary Versus a Coercive Society

What is it that the idealists in the world, the gentle as well as the angry, want, and for what are they striving?

They are looking for a "good society." They know a "good society" cannot be rife with violence. What kind of society, then, do they endeavor to construct?

1. Moses set up a society leaving everything free, except he prohibited injuring the neighbor. He declared, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. This made each man himself the standard.

2. Marx set up a society making everything coercive. He declared, from each according to his ability to each according to his need. This made the neighbor the standard. Freedom is impossible in such a society. A man is a slave to his neighbors individually, or as the idea always is put into practice, a man is a slave to his neighbors collectively.

3. Nygren would set up a third kind of society, an *agape* society. It is the Marxian society with the neighbor and not the self as the standard, but instead of the coercion of collective action through the state, *agape* is voluntarily to accomplish for each neighbor individually what Marxism accomplishes coercively and collectively.

The ideas of Marx are widely accepted in the so-called Christian churches. The means to accomplish that acceptance were first, to feel obligated to have as sanctimonious a law as Marx, and

secondly, to interpret the teachings of Christ in the New Testament as being different from the teachings of Moses in the Old Testament, namely, as teaching an *agape* as defined by Nygren.

The Bond of Society — Legitimate Self-Regarding Interests

Many pious have turned toward a Marxian and Nygrenian definition because they have been persuaded that, except there be coercion or *agape,* society will be chaotic and suicidal. The pursuit of the self-regarding interests (except that such pursuit at the expense of the neighbor is prohibited) is assumed to be warfare, destructive, disorganizing, unplanned, unloving. The pursuit of the neighbor's interest is automatically considered cooperation, constructive, organized, planned and loving.

With Scripture we choose for a society in which every man is not only authorized but enjoined to pursue his legitimate self-regarding interests. With Scripture we choose against a society in which every man is prohibited from pursuing his self-regarding interests because he must ascertain what the neighbor wishes.

Walter Lippmann in his book, *The Good Society,* declares that an individualist society always becomes (1) free, (2) peaceful, and (3) prosperous; and that a collectivist society always becomes (1) tyrannical, (2) bellicose and (3) impoverished. The good society which is free, peaceful and prosperous is a society based on the law of Scripture, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. The bad society which is tyrannical, bellicose and poor is a society based on a contrary law, thou shalt love thy neighbor by doing his wishes, which is usually expressed by the formula, from each according to his ability to each according to his need.

Why the situation works out as Lippmann declares is simple, but the argument is in the field of the social sciences. That argument need not be based on the authority of Scripture; it is reserved for consideration in a later issue.

Summary

According to Scripture, you are free in choices and action. Your neighbor is also free in choices and action. You may not coerce your neighbor. Your neighbor may not coerce you. Or

more detailed, the scriptural law of love is: (1) thou shalt not harm the neighbor, and (2) thou shalt have goodwill toward him. By goodwill is meant (a) forebearance and forgiveness; (b) a well-wishing attitude; (c) charity; and (d) proclamation of the Gospel.

Contrary to Scripture, the other law is that you are not free in choices and action. Your neighbor is not free in choices and action. You may coerce your neighbor. He may coerce you. When there is a conflict, the group may coerce, or whoever collectively or individually has the power to do so. Or if you do not coerce or are not coerced, you still are not free nor are your neighbors free, because each has an *agape* obligation to all the others. Each must be ready, according to *agape,* to adjust himself to others in order to attain "authentic community." *Agape* requires it. Or more explicitly, the nonscriptural law of love is that society must be organized in a voluntary collectivism, a 100 percent charity, and there must be a nondiscriminating *agape* attitude; further, each can coerce his judgments and values on the neighbor, if necessary at the expense of third parties, and under no circumstances must the neighbor's feelings be hurt.

The extension, beyond Scripture, is very simple; your neighbor and not yourself is the standard. It is as simple as that. Instead of, thou shalt love thy neighbor *as thyself,* the law is changed to, thou shalt love thy neighbor *to suit his fancy.* He is no better off than you are; he must love you *to suit your fancy.*

PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM LEAGUE
366 East 166th Street
South Holland, Illinois, U.S.A.

BULK RATE
U. S. Postage
PAID
SOUTH HOLLAND, I
Permit No. 12

POSTMASTER:
If change of address on file, notify us on Form 3547 (for which postage is guaranteed).
If not deliverable, check reason in spaces below. Return postage guaranteed.
☐ Returned at sender's request
☐ No such Post Office in state named
☐ Moved—left no address
☐ Refused
☐ Unclaimed or unknown